

Discretized Superstring in Three Dimensional Superspace

Parthasarathi Majumdar

The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, CIT Campus, Madras 600113, India.

Abstract

The partition function of the discretized superstring in a target superspace of three (Euclidean) bosonic dimensions, is shown, for a fixed triangulation of the random world sheet, to be derived from the partition function of a discretized bosonic string with an external field present in the action in the form of a specific constant matrix, using first order forms of the actions. This latter partition function appears more amenable to an exact analytical treatment.

The theory of strings in spacetimes of dimension lower than the critical dimension stands far from complete. Most attempts are stymied by the so-called $c_m \leq 1$ barrier, [1,2] where c_m is the central charge of the matter two dimensional conformal field theory (CFT) on the (random) string world sheet. In the continuum approach, the conformal mode of the world sheet metric plays the role of an additional target space dimension, [3] so that $D = c_m + 1$ for the bosonic string. It follows that, for the susceptibility of the bosonic non-critical string to have real critical exponents, $D \leq 2$. This pathology manifests even more clearly in the discretized version of the theory (by dynamical triangulations of the random 2d surface) [4–6], in that the lattice string tension does not scale to zero at the critical point [7,8]. This implies that the discrete random surface does not admit a continuum limit for embeddings in (bosonic) spacetimes of $D > 2$, possibly degenerating into an ensemble of branched polymers (see, e.g., ref. [9]).

In this letter, we consider an extension of the Polyakov string with target space supersymmetry, by embedding the 2d random surface in a *superspace* with three bosonic (Euclidean) directions. If a continuum limit exists for this theory, the Liouville field will supply the

fourth dimension of what may be a realistic target spacetime. Here the fermionic coordinates are target space ($SO(3)$) spinors but world sheet scalars which are anticommuting. The resemblance with the $b-c$ ghost system of the bosonic string vis-a-vis world sheet properties leads to the possibility that these coordinates contribute negatively to c_m , although, strictly speaking that really depends on their dynamics. If however this is the case, then the relation $D = c_m + 1$ of the bosonic string will no longer be true, and one can indeed have $D > 2$ while maintaining $c_m \leq 1$. [10]

A second motivation for considering such an extension comes from numerical work by Ambjorn and Varsted [11] wherein some improvements over the bosonic case have been obtained in the estimates for the ratio of the average circumference and radius of the discretized world sheet. However, these are subject to the usual restrictions due to limitations on computer memory etc. So an analytical handle on the partition function appears desirable. A complete solution to this problem is still beyond our reach; the following is hopefully a step in that direction.

The partition function for a two dimensional triangulated random surface (assumed to be of spherical topology for simplicity) with matter is given as a sum over triangulations T as, [5,6]

$$Z = \sum_T \exp\{-\Lambda|T|\} \rho(T) Z_m^T \quad (1)$$

where Λ is the ‘cosmological constant’ $|T|$ is the number of triangles for a given triangulation, which equals the area of the random surface; $\rho(T)$ is a symmetry factor, while Z_m^T is the partition function for matter for a given triangulation. For the discretized version of the bosonic Polyakov string, which corresponds to an embedding of the random surface in a space of 3 (Euclidean) dimensions, the matter partition function is given by,

$$Z_m^T = \int \prod_{\mu=1}^3 \prod_{i=1}^N dX_i^\mu \exp\left\{- \sum_{\langle ij \rangle; \mu} (X_i^\mu - X_j^\mu)^2\right\} . \quad (2)$$

If we introduce the link variables P_{ij}^μ , defined to be antisymmetric in i and j , the Gaussian action in (2) can be linearized with respect to the X_i^μ ’s, giving the first order form [11]

$$S[X, P] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle; \mu} \{ (P_{ij}^\mu)^2 + 2i(X_i^\mu - X_j^\mu) P_{ij}^\mu \} . \quad (3)$$

The corresponding matter partition function can be rewritten after integrating over the X variables as

$$Z_m^T = \int \prod_{\mu; \langle ij \rangle} dP_{ij}^\mu \exp \{ \sum_{\mu; \langle ij \rangle} (P_{ij}^\mu)^2 \} \prod_{\mu; i} \delta(\sum_j P_{ij}^\mu) . \quad (4)$$

In the supersymmetric case, the partition function for the first order form of the action is given by [11,12]

$$\tilde{Z}_m^T = \int \prod_{\mu; \langle ij \rangle} dP_{ij}^\mu \prod_{\mu; i} dX_i^\mu \prod_i d\theta_i \exp -\tilde{S}[X, P; \theta] , \quad (5)$$

where,

$$\tilde{S}[X, P; \theta] = \sum_{\mu; \langle ij \rangle} \left[(P_{ij}^\mu)^2 + 2iP_{ij}^\mu (X_i^\mu - X_j^\mu + i\bar{\theta}_i \sigma^\mu \theta_j) \right] . \quad (6)$$

The integrations over both the X and the θ variables can be done exactly, yielding [11]

$$\tilde{Z}_m^T = \int \prod_{\mu; \langle ij \rangle} dP_{ij}^\mu e^{-\sum_{\mu; \langle ij \rangle} (P_{ij}^\mu)^2} \text{Det} \left(\sum_\mu (\sigma^\mu P^\mu) \right) \prod_{\mu; i} \delta(\sum_j P_{ij}^\mu) , \quad (7)$$

where, the P_{ij}^μ for different μ are assumed to commute, as in ref. [11]. We now use a standard formula for expressing a $2N \times 2N$ determinant (viz. that obtained from the fermionic integration) in terms of an $N \times N$ determinant, to get

$$\text{Det}(\sum_\mu \sigma^\mu P_{ij}^\mu) = \text{Det}(-\sum_\mu (P^\mu)^2) , \quad (8)$$

so that,

$$\tilde{Z}_m^T = \int \prod_{\mu; \langle ij \rangle} dP_{ij}^\mu e^{-\sum_{\mu; \langle ij \rangle} (P_{ij}^\mu)^2} \text{Det} \left(-\sum_\mu (P^\mu)^2 \right) \prod_{\mu; i} \delta(\sum_j P_{ij}^\mu) . \quad (9)$$

It is tempting to interpret eq. (9) as the partition function for a three-matrix model with a ‘non-singlet’ delta function constraint and a potential which is a sum of Gaussian and logarithmic parts; recall however that the P_{ij}^μ are link variables on the triangular lattice. Thus,

the interpretation as a random matrix model will go through provided appropriate constraints are inserted into the integral. To this end, we introduce the *adjacency* or *incidence* matrix,

$$D_{ij} \equiv \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i \text{ and } j \text{ are nearest neighbours} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

With this definition the partition function (9) can be written as

$$\tilde{Z}_m^T = \int \prod_{\mu} \mathcal{D}P^{\mu} e^{\text{Tr}\left\{\sum_{\mu}(P^{\mu})^2 + \ln[\sum_{\mu}(P^{\mu})^2]\right\}} \prod_{\mu; i \neq j} \delta\left((1 - D_{ij})P_{ij}^{\mu}\right) \prod_{\mu; i} \delta\left(\sum_j P_{ij}^{\mu}\right) . \quad (10)$$

Obviously, this is the partition function of a 3-matrix model with ‘non-singlet’ delta-function constraints. For general random antisymmetric matrices, the same orthogonal transformation, of course, does not diagonalize all three matrices simultaneously. Notice that in this case the matrix integration space is restricted to the space of independent fluctuating link variables, rather than being totally random, due to imposition of the delta-function constraint. The mutually commuting property of the P^{μ} for different values of μ is valid on this constraint surface.

Consider now, the partition function

$$\mathcal{Z}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N) \equiv \prod_{\mu} \int \mathcal{D}P^{\mu} e^{\text{Tr}[A(P^{\mu})^2]} \prod_{ij} \delta((1 - D_{ij})P_{ij}^{\mu}) \prod_i \delta\left(\sum_j P_{ij}^{\mu}\right) , \quad (11)$$

where, the matrix A is a real symmetric $N \times N$ matrix defined as follows: for every orthogonal transformation which ‘diagonalizes’ P^{μ} (i.e., diagonalizes the real symmetric matrix $(P^{\mu})^2$) for any μ , A is defined by a similarity transformation with the same orthogonal matrix on the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(a_1 \ a_2 \ \dots \ a_N)$, $a_i > 0$. In other words, the matrix A is classical in so far as its eigenvalues are concerned, while its ‘angular’ parts share the randomness of the P^{μ} .

With such a definition, the eq. (11) can be rewritten with some abuse of notation, as

$$\mathcal{Z}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N) = \int \prod_{\mu} \mathcal{D}P^{\mu} e^{\sum_i [a_i \sum_{\mu} (p_i^{\mu})^2]} \prod_{\mu; i, j} \delta((1 - D_{ij})P_{ij}^{\mu}) \prod_{\mu; i} \delta\left(\sum_j P_{ij}^{\mu}\right) , \quad (12)$$

where, p_i^{μ} are the eigenvalues of P^{μ} . We have not written out the integration measure in terms of integrations over the eigenvalues and the angular variables of the orthogonal

transformation that diagonalizes P^μ and also the appropriate Jacobian (the Van der Monde determinant), because we do not intend to perform any explicit matrix integration here. The essential point is that the exponential in the integrand is independent of the angular variables.

Notice first that, the bosonic partition function

$$Z_m^T = \mathcal{Z}(1, 1, \dots, 1) . \quad (13)$$

The point of importance now is that the supersymmetric partition function (10) *can be derived* from (12), as we proceed to show.

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_i \frac{\partial}{\partial a_i} \mathcal{Z} &= \int \prod_\mu \mathcal{D}P^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial a_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial a_2} \dots \frac{\partial}{\partial a_N} e^{\sum_{\mu,i} a_i (p_i^\mu)^2} \times \{constraints\} \\ &= \int \prod_\mu \mathcal{D}P^\mu e^{Tr[A \sum_\mu (P^\mu)^2]} \prod_i [\sum_\mu (p_i^\mu)^2] \times \{constraints\} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where,

$$\{constraints\} \equiv \prod_{\mu,i,j} \delta((1 - D_{ij})P_{ij}^\mu) \prod_{\mu,i} \delta(\sum_j P_{ij}^\mu) . \quad (15)$$

Since

$$\prod_i [\sum_\mu (p_i^\mu)^2] = Det[\sum_\mu (P^\mu)^2] , \quad (16)$$

which occurs in the supersymmetric partition function (10), we observe that

$$\tilde{Z}_m^T = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial a_i} \mathcal{Z}(a_1, \dots, a_N) |_{a_i=a_2=\dots=a_N=1} . \quad (17)$$

This is the main result of the paper. Thus, if the partition function (11) can be calculated exactly as a function of the $\{a_i\}$, then the supersymmetric partition function can indeed be obtained analytically. The computation of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ is in progress [13] and will be reported elsewhere.

Notice that if $\mathcal{Z}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N)$ is Taylor-expanded around the point $a_i = 1$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ in powers of the a_i , then the bosonic partition function is the first term in the expansion,

while the supersymmetric partition function corresponds to the coefficient of the term $\prod_i a_i$ upto a factor of $N!$. It then follows that this ‘parent’ model represents a sort of generating function for discretized string theories and, as such, warrants investigation on its own right. Similar one-matrix models for Hermitian matrices, with an arbitrary non-singular external matrix field were analyzed in the large N limit in the saddle point of approximation by Das et. al. [14] and also by Alvarez-Gaumé and Barbón [15], as attempts to construct higher dimensional matrix models of non-critical strings. Our analysis has been restricted to the matter partition function for a fixed triangulation and a very specific matrix A , which might allow an exact solution for all N , notwithstanding the complications of handling non-singlet delta function constraints.

Of course, the sum over triangulations will still remain to be performed. The eventual aim envisages a computation of the lattice string tension a la ref.s [7,8], and study of its scaling behaviour near the critical point. This alone will enable one to decide as to whether a continuum string theory exists without the pathologies of the bosonic string.

To conclude, if a continuum limit does indeed exist, the target space supersymmetry will not extend into the extra ‘time’ direction that emerges as a transmutation of the Liouville field, i.e., we shall only have a world with three dimensional *space* supersymmetry. It is very likely that space supersymmetry is adequate to produce a non-critical string theory with a tachyon-free spectrum, [16] while spacetime itself no longer has the full four dimensional supersymmetry. The crucial issue in that case will be the vanishing of the cosmological constant rather than a non-perturbative mechanism of spacetime supersymmetry breaking.

I am grateful to J. Ambjorn for bringing ref. [11] to my attention and also for a useful discussion. I thank R. Anishetty, R. Basu, G. Date, S. Govindarajan, N. D. Haridass, T. Jayaraman and V. John for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Knizhnik, A. Polyakov and A. Zamolodchikov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A3**, 819 (1988).
- [2] F. David, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A3**, 509 (1988); J. Distler and H. Kawai, Nucl. Phys. **B321**, 509 (1988).
- [3] S. Das, A. Dhar, A. Sengupta and S. Wadia, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A5**, 799 (1990).
- [4] V. Kazakov, I. Kostov and A. Migdal, Phys. Lett. **157B**, 295 (1985).
- [5] J. Ambjorn, B. Durhuus and J. Frölich, Nucl. Phys. **B257**, 433 (1985)
- [6] F. David, Nucl. Phys. **B257**, 543 (1985)
- [7] B. Durhuus, J. Frölich and T. Jonsson, Nucl. Phys. **B240**, 453 (1984).
- [8] J. Ambjorn and B. Durhuus, Phys. Lett. **188B**, 253 (1987).
- [9] J. Ambjorn, B. Durhuus, T. Jonsson and G. Thorleifsson, Niels Bohr Institute Preprint NBI-HE-92-35 (1992).
- [10] The corresponding matter CFT may be non-unitary, but with coupling to the random surface, the issue of unitarity is nontrivial even for CFTs which are unitary in flat space. We donot discuss this issue in this letter.
- [11] J. Ambjorn and S. Varsted, Phys. Lett. **257B**, 305 (1991).
- [12] A. Miković and W. Siegel, Phys. Lett **240B**, 363 (1990).
- [13] P. Majumdar, work in progress.
- [14] S. Das, A. Dhar, A. Sengupta and S. Wadia, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A5**, 1041 (1990).
- [15] L. Alvarez-Gaume' and J. Barbón, CERN preprint CERN-TH-6464/92 (1992).
- [16] A. Kutasov and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **251B**, 67 (1990).